

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Carson City District Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

---

**Project Creator:** Matt Simons, Realty Specialist

**Field Office:** Stillwater Field Office

**Lead Office:** Stillwater Field Office

**Case File/Project Number:** N-91780

**Applicable Categorical Exclusion:** H-1790-1, Appendix 4 E(12)

“Grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of other compatibly developed rights-of-way.”

**NEPA Number:** DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2014-0015-CX

**Project Name:** Travis Land Sale perpetual right-of-way.

**Project Description:** Conversion of the existing pre-Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) right-of-way (ROW), granted on September 5, 1975, to a perpetual term under the authority of FLPMA. The BLM has proposed to sell a portion of the public lands the existing power line ROW crosses. As allowed under 43 CFR 2807.15(b), the new grant would authorize, within a 25-foot wide ROW, one mile of existing power line for a perpetual term, in accordance with the Final BLM Policy and Procedures for Issuance of “Long Term” Right-of-Way Grants and Easements Over Public Lands to Be Transferred Out of Federal Ownership (June 2007). Approximately 3.03 acres of public land would be contained in the ROW, more-or-less. The new grant would authorize Sierra Pacific Power Company (NV Energy) to continue to operate the power line in essentially the manner they currently do. Existing roads could be used to access the line to do routine inspections and maintenance.

**Applicant Name:** Sierra Pacific Power Company

**Project Location:**

Within the following described parts:

Mount Diablo Meridian

T. 21 N., R. 39 E.,  
sec. 14, E½W½.

**BLM Acres for the Project Area:** 3.03 acres, more-or-less.

**Land Use Plan Conformance:**

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with Administrative Actions listed on page ROW-4 of the Right-of-way Corridor section and would comply with the Standard Operating Procedures listed on pages ROW-4 through ROW-6.

**Name of Plan:** Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001)

**Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances:** The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria: (Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

**Stillwater Field Office**

<i>If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.</i>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		X
2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? (Archeology, Recreation, Wilderness, Wildlife, Range by allotment, Water Quality)		X
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (PEC)		X
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		X
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? (PEC)		X
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		X
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office? (Archeology)		X
8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? (Wildlife)		X
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (PEC and Archeology)		X
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		X
11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)? (Archeology)		X
12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		X

## **SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:**

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

Planning Environmental Coordinator: Angelica Rose  
Public Health and Safety/Noxious Weeds: Jill Devaurs  
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC: Dan Westermeyer  
Archeology: Jason Wright  
Wildlife: Chris Kula  
Soils/Grazing: Linda Appel / Chelsy Simerson / Jill Devaurs

**CONCLUSION:** Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

/S/ C. James, Acting

Teresa J. Knutson  
Field Manager  
Stillwater Field Office

05/12/14

(date)